

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
NORTHERN DIVISION**

**MICHAEL COREY JENKINS, et al.**

**PLAINTIFFS**

**v.**

**CAUSE NO. 3:23cv374-DPJ-ASH**

**RANKIN COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI, et al.**

**DEFENDANTS**

---

**REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' [58] SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO [35] RENEWED MOTION  
FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS PREMISED, IN PART, ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY**

---

**NOW COME** Defendants, Rankin County, Mississippi and Sheriff Bryan Bailey, by and through counsel, and in support of their renewed Rule 12(c) motion, state as follows:

Plaintiffs' [58] Supplemental Response is in actuality a surreply, which are "heavily disfavored by courts." *Rubi v. BP Expl. & Prod., Inc.*, No. 1:19cv481-HSO-RPM, 2022 WL 275517, at \*3 (S.D. Miss. Jan. 28, 2022) (quoting *Warrior Energy Servs. Corp. v. ATP Titan M/V*, 551 F. App'x 749, 751 n.2 (5th Cir. 2014)). A non-movant should only be granted leave to file a surreply when a movant's reply brief raises new arguments and the court is to consider those new arguments in its decision. *Rubi*, 2022 WL 275517, at \*3 (quoting *RedHawk Holdings Corp. v. Schreiber Tr. of Schreiber Living Tr. - DTD 2/8/95*, 836 F. App'x 232, 235 (5th Cir. 2020)). Accordingly, the Court should not consider Plaintiffs' [58] Supplemental Response in ruling on these Defendants' [35] motion.

In the alternative, should the Court choose to consider any part of the [58] Supplemental Response, these Defendants respectfully request that they be granted a reasonable amount of time in which to respond to any new arguments raised in same.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED**, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2024.

**RANKIN COUNTY & SHERIFF BRYAN BAILEY-  
DEFENDANTS**

**BY:** /s/ Jason E. Dare  
**JASON E. DARE**

**OF COUNSEL:**

Jason E. Dare (MSB No. 100973)  
[jdare@bislawyers.com](mailto:jdare@bislawyers.com)  
BIGGS, INGRAM & SOLOP, PLLC  
Post Office Box 14028  
Jackson, Mississippi 39236-4028  
Telephone: (601) 987-5307  
Facsimile: (601) 987-5307